

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 08179561 3

Ten

10

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

BY

JOHN C. TEN EYCK, A.M.

MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK BAR

NEW YORK

MOFFAT, YARD AND COMPANY:

1907

208443A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

R

1925

L

COPYRIGHT, 1907

BY

MOFFAT, YARD AND COMPANY

NEW YORK

PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER, 1907

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

GOVERNMENT FOR THE PEOPLE

813 X 318

CONTENTS

I. EXISTING POLITICAL EVILS.....	7
II. REMEDIES.....	27
III. METHODS.....	47

Government for the People

I

EXISTING POLITICAL EVILS

IT seems to the writer of this paper that the statements contained in it must be familiar and the conclusions reached in it must be obvious to all who have given serious thought to the subject of popular government. The position of many good men shows, however, that this is not the case.

Almost all citizens in this country vote, but only a few of them are active in politics. If the average citizen should ask at random twenty men of his personal acquaintance whether they are active politicians, the chances are that to a man they would reply in the negative.

Nearly all professional men, manufacturers and tradesmen, and the ma-

jority of artisans and laborers, take satisfaction in stating that they attend to their own affairs and leave politics to the politicians.

It follows that the active conduct of public matters is left in the hands of those who remain, when nearly all professional and business men, artisans and laborers are left out.

It is worth while to attempt to define the elements that make up this remaining active class, to describe its methods of procedure, and to estimate the extent of its powers and the existing limitations upon the exercise of its powers. It is also worth while to consider the evils that result from the predominance of a small political class and to suggest, if possible, remedies for these evils.

An accurate description of the makeup of the group of active politicians in each community may be impossible, but it may be said in general terms that this group includes those who depend upon office holding for a living. In addition,

it includes a comparatively small number of men—a small percentage of professional and business men, a larger percentage of artisans and laborers—whose sole reason for political activity is their wish to forward the general welfare. It includes almost all men who want special favors from the government; all who desire to obtain public contracts or patronage; and all who seek the adoption of policies beneficial to their private interests; and it embraces most men, whatever their station in life may be, who need protection in prosecuting questionable enterprises or who seek immunity from punishment. Of such elements is our governing class compounded.

No doubt both active politicians and other citizens are, for the most part, sincerely desirous of the public good. Our history, education and institutions are such as to make patriotism common, but those who are active in politics are, for the most part, set going or kept

going in this business because it is to their special interest to attend to it. They generally desire that government shall be well administered; but they also wish that it shall be administered in such manner and by such persons that its administration shall inure to their special advantage.

On the other hand, the great body of citizens who are inactive in politics neglect their political duties because they have other things to attend to. Most of them are too busy in the pursuit of wealth or pleasure to trouble themselves much about public affairs. They desire good government, but they care less for it than they do for private advantage. They insist that government shall be well administered; but they desire its administration to be carried on without inconvenience to them and without interfering with the realization of their private aims. Some of them would doubtless be willing, from time to time, to subordinate their

private interests to the public good, if they realized the need or saw the advantage of doing so. These men frequently rely on what are termed "American Institutions" for their salvation, and seem not to realize that, if the people would govern, they must not only vote but must select candidates to be voted for.

A consideration of the comparative merits or demerits of the active and inactive groups of citizens above mentioned should only be undertaken, if at all, to show the right line of conduct in public matters. For this purpose, solely, it may be permissible to say that if a man love much his wife, his family, his home, his country, or anything else, he will often think of the object of his love; he will keep it always in his heart, and will, at least occasionally, put aside all other things in order to work for the good of that which he ardently loves.

If today some Diogenes should light his candle and set about finding a

patriotic man, he would be more apt to discover him among those who are actively concerned in public affairs than among those who do nothing in this business.

As far as voting goes, but few citizens neglect their duty. Many of those who must be classified as inactive politicians even take part in primary elections, but those whom they vote for, both at the primaries and on election day, are, for the most part, selected by active politicians.

In order to see how this is done, and to estimate the effect of its being done and to devise a remedy for the evils that it causes, some understanding of political organization is requisite.

The normal makeup of each party in an American community is an organization or machine in control, having leaders, or more generally a leader, and opposed by a minority or opposition.

The essence of an organization is that, through influence over active party

men, it controls primaries, and has thereby the power to determine the policies and select the personal factors of government. If this power be lost, the opposition becomes the organization unless, as is sometimes the case, a period of disorder ensues at the end of which a new organization is formed.

The most important element of an organization is that group of active politicians who have a positive influence in determining its policy. After these come those partisans who vote with the organization at the primaries.

Corresponding to the organization, but less clearly defined in structure and methods, is the opposition. The object of the opposition is to obtain the power to nominate and thus become the organization.

Back of both organization and opposition are the great body of partisans who take little if any interest in party matters except to vote the party ticket on election day. Beyond the line of

party activity altogether come the independent voters.

The organization is that group of politicians which chiefly merits consideration because the opposition and the independents perform chiefly negative functions, unless they acquire control of the primaries and become substantially the organization.

The best time for considering the organization's work is that period of the year when candidates must be selected to be supported by the organization at the primaries. It is clear that, if the organization is to retain its power, its most active and influential members must select nominees who will win at the primaries. Ability to win at the primaries is the first qualification for a candidate and, if he cannot stand this test, he need not be considered because, if rejected at the primary, the organization will have injured both itself and him by putting him up for nomination.

In order to select men who will win

at the primary, the desires of those forces in the locality concerned, that actively participate in party politics, the principal elements of which have been already defined, must be accurately gauged. The leader, if there be a leader, may call a caucus but, whether he does so or not, the considerations that will control the choice of candidates are the same. Whether a caucus be held or not, every group of electors that is active in party life and has organized itself and become coherent and, by its activity and coherence, has become powerful to effect the result of the primaries, must receive respectful attention, and will have an affirmative influence in determining the selection of candidates.

All citizens, on the other hand, who have withdrawn from active party life, retain a negative influence solely, an influence that can seldom accomplish more than to determine the choice between two or more candidates, either

of whom is satisfactory to the active party forces.

It is possible that a few men representing only the general desire of the public for good government, and no special interest, may be consulted about the choice of candidates; if so, they are consulted rather as unaccredited envoys from an allied state, whose good will is desired, than as delegates from a federated power entitled to representation; for that body of citizens whose views they might represent if it had knowledge of party affairs so as to form a policy, interest and courage to propose a policy, and cohesion and spirit to support it at the primaries, sleeps, or if awake confines its efforts to denouncing the acts of others and threatening them with punishment.

The conference, if an actual conference be called, proceeds to business; deliberates, discusses, decides, rises. The most important party act of the year has been performed, and every

element in society has had an affirmative influence upon the result achieved except that element which represents public spirited desire for good government, independent of personal advantage.

It must of course be admitted that the desires of public spirited citizens are not ignored; perhaps the leader's most important and common service to the community is to remind his followers that they cannot have everything their own way, and that a certain deference to the wishes of those who desire only the general welfare must be exercised or the party will meet with defeat at the polls. Inasmuch as the safest policy for the leader to pursue is to recognize the wishes of public spirited citizens, his influence, through policy, if for no other reason, is likely to be thrown on their side.

In addition to this, there are many considerations that make it probable that in most cases he wishes good gov-

ernment; but whether this be so or not, it is necessary for him to recognize, up to the danger point, the wishes of the active forces in the party, in order to control the primary.

The foregoing illustration of the methods and results of organization politics, in the selection of candidates for office, applies not only to the selection of local candidates, but, inasmuch as local organizations select delegates to conventions held to nominate county, state and national officers, it is equally applicable to the entire field of American politics.

The great mass of American citizens whose political ideals are untinged by selfish interests retain initiative in no political field, and this condition of affairs arises solely from their failure to perform their political duty. As long as primary and election laws are square (and no complaint has been made of their unfairness) there can be no usurpation of power by a minority.

If a minority of our people monopolize the privilege of selecting candidates, it is because the majority neglect or refuse to do what must be done in order to participate in the enjoyment of this privilege.

The purpose of this writing is not to assess the political morality of either those who are active or those who are inactive in political life.

A certain degree of selfishness is incidental to the fight for life. It has marked the periods of the world's greatest progress, and will undoubtedly continue to influence men whether engaged in business, in politics, or in any other field of human effort.

We are in no position to criticise those who come up to the average standard in this regard.

What we are concerned with, are the acts of active politicians, and the omissions of others, and the effect of these acts and omissions. Moreover, it is probable that many of the inactive,

being desirous of the public good, would take more interest in politics, if they realized that the sure result of their inactivity, taken in connection with the inactivity of the majority of their fellow citizens, is to turn over the control of public matters to men whose conduct of them is directed or influenced by selfish interest. It is equally probable that most political leaders would pursue the general welfare in many instances where they are turned from its pursuit by the wishes of their active supporters if they did not know that they can accomplish no good by so doing and that its pursuit in existing political conditions would only result in transferring their power to less scrupulous leaders.

The loss of direct party influence by the majority of our citizens has not, it need hardly be said, been the result of concerted action on their part, and it is probable that but few of them are willing to assume any share of respon-

sibility in the premises. Little as they may prize such limited political opportunities as are reserved to citizens in a representative government, when the effect of neglecting these opportunities comes to their attention they are emphatic in their protests; and, although they have no right to complain, it must be a matter of general concern that most citizens who are solely desirous of good government retain little if any initiative in party matters.

Very naturally they seek to bestow responsibility for their condition upon others, and almost invariably they lay it at the door of the professional politician and regard unfavorably whatever the latter may do. They give but lukewarm support to policies adopted by distrusted leaders. Their state of mind makes them easy prey for the schemes of the opposition, and the opposition is on the alert, in every locality, to fan the flame of discontent. It is not necessary for the op-

position to act as a body, nor is it politic that its leaders should call attention to their personal aims, or should publish their desire to have the opposition usurp the functions of the organization and continue prevailing methods without material change except in the identity of personal factors. Its policy and practice is to criticise the acts and methods of the organization, and it is easy to understand that its criticisms of organization matters are listened to with open ears by citizens who are inactive in political life and are by them repeated and magnified.

It results that in all parts of the country the very men who, if they had participated in party management, would, by reason of their disinterested public spirit, have been able to justify all proper policies adopted in party management, become the purveyors of scandal and of indiscriminating abuse. It turns out that whatever party has been in power in any locality in the country is the chosen

target for the invective of those who, under normal conditions, would have been its ablest apologists and defenders. Disorder and disorganization prevail in party life.

Nor is this the worst to be said; for disorganization in party life is the signal for activity on the part of doctrinaires and discontented politicians. Whatever political remedy has been conceived of as a substitute for the honest co-operation of citizens of the republic in pursuing the legitimate aims of government now has a hearing and gains adherents. Its advocates can at least say that it cannot be worse than government so administered as to inure to the private advantage of members of the political class although the public interest may suffer by such administrations.

Moreover, every discredited politician whose folly or selfishness has demonstrated his inability to take part in an orderly scheme of government now

sees his opportunity to rehabilitate his fallen fortunes. With a surprised hope of political preferment, he buckles on the armour of reform, and demands that somebody should "go." He points with indignation to the evils of the times and exploits his own civic righteousness by an unmeasured denunciation of the sinfulness of others and in particular of those whom he envies.

It is by no means implied that honest men are not today justly indignant at dishonesty, wherever it may exist; nor can dishonesty be justified by showing that those who are loudest in denouncing it are largely responsible for it. It is, at the same time, probable that there is an unusually large percentage of hypocrites among the critics of active party men at this time.

As a result of this condition of things, it may be anticipated that many political quacks and pretenders will, with the aid of their unconscious allies among private citizens of the best type obtain for

themselves political preferment. From day to day they are gaining the confidence of restless masses and that in a period of world-wide economic unrest. They are calling on those who "have not" to shake off the lethargy of ages; to organize so that they may enter into the inheritance of those "who have." They challenge the fundamental axioms of economic law. They preach doctrines that in other countries threaten economic if not dynastic revolution. In the meantime those who might represent sane governmental policies administered in the interest of all, sleep, or, if awake, pass their time in futile discussions or complaints. They plan, perhaps, the overthrow of some petty political "Boss"; "they slap at mosquitoes while the elephants are pulling down their houses,"

"The just punishment of those who do not themselves govern is to be illy governed."

II

REMEDIES

VARIOUS remedies have been proposed for the unsatisfactory condition and prospects of party politics. Some critics of present methods have avowed their intentions to vote for the best man—irrespective of party. This would result in a choice of officials opposed in principle to many of their supporters and, if followed to its logical conclusion, would be the end of party government.

Wherever men have set about governing themselves parties have sprung up, and this of necessity because it is only by means of parties that the people can say what they want done and can choose between opposing policies. A Governor or a President may be elected without a party platform,

but he will not know how his supporters desire him to act. He will be an autocrat with the time limit. He may govern well, but the people will not govern, for the people will not direct his policies. If this kind of government be set up, the time will come when those who govern will govern badly, for the only way to insure that government will be run in the interest of the people is to have the people do the governing. But the people cannot govern unless they let their wishes be known by supporting at the polls a platform embodying their policies.

Others propose to vote for candidates of the opposite party, in local and state elections, until their own party shall be purified.

Representatives of the inactive class of party men who adopt this expedient say in effect to the politicians of their party, "We do not challenge your exclusive political initiative in our party, but we are voting for nominees selected

on the exclusive initiative of politicians of another party. We do this because we wish to create a wholesome fear in the minds of politicians of both parties, to the end that fit nominations be made."

It must be admitted that, when such men speak in this way, they exercise a legitimate, if belated, political influence. To put those vested with political power in fear of loss of power, if they shall make a bad use of power, has been the refuge of the oppressed of all nations, from time immemorial. But democratic government is founded so as to prevent the existence of such power in a few as would call for this warning.

The plan under consideration is limited in its scope: The power to select the agents by whom government is to be administered carries with it the power of government itself; and this power the plan leaves with the active political minority that has been defined.

It is limited in the subject matter to which it extends; for it can rarely if ever be successfully applied except to nominate to high office prominent men on whom the attention of the masses has been (in some way not provided for by our political system) concentrated.

If conscientious citizens, as a whole, shall assume the discharge of political duty by direct participation in party matters, there will be no necessity to resort to this plan for they will thereby regain the power to select nominees. If they fail to assume the discharge of this duty, and, by reason of such failure, remain unorganized and incapable of dealing intelligently with details, the plan under consideration can not generally be applied so as to secure good nominations for minor and local offices.

In addition to this, whatever good may be achieved by the adoption of this plan can only be temporary,

because men will no longer unite in the course of conduct under consideration, after the evils that have called them into activity shall have been abated.

This plan has frequently been adopted through conscientious motives and, within the limited scope above indicated, has sometimes achieved admirable results. It is, nevertheless, fraught with danger to the state, and is in no case productive of unmixed good to the state, or to those who resort to it.

It is dangerous to the state because many must unite in it at the same time in order to make it effective, and the process of ranking a large body of party men in opposition to the party whose platform embodies their political principles involves such bitter and long-continued criticism of the active politicians of that party, such counter-criticism of the politicians of the other party, as to shake public confidence in politicians as a class, to make promi-

nence in public service a mark of obloquy; to discredit, without discrimination, the agencies of popular government; to discourage men of high character from entering the public service except under conditions that can seldom arise; and to bring popular government itself into disrepute.

It tends, moreover, to make officeholders independent of party control, and thus to substitute the rule of individuals for government by the people.

The plan works injury to one who adopts it, because it puts him out of touch with men of influence in his own party; shuts him off from information necessary to enable him to form a sane judgment in party matters; opens his ears to selfish schemers and discredited politicians; results in his voting for candidates pledged to party principles antagonistic to those that he entertains; and deprives him, as well as his party, of all positive influence on his part in shaping its policy.

While the expedient under consideration has been and will be resorted to by conscientious party men in grave crises and for the purpose of correcting abuses that may have grown so rank as to seem otherwise beyond control, it is burdened with consequences so serious that it cannot, with safety, be permanently adopted as a substitute for the conscientious discharge of political duty by direct participation in party matters by party men.

Another remedy suggested for existing political evils consists of the formation of independent bodies in local politics. Special local conditions may demand this course in future, as they have in the past, but the relief afforded can only be local at best; moreover, it can only be temporary, inasmuch as such bodies, when clothed with power, must nominate candidates approved by their leaders, or the fruits of victory will be lost, and must, by reason of so doing, become substantially organiza-

tions that differ from the ordinary party organization only in the lack of definite party principles and of the coherence resulting from historic ties and from organic connections with national and state politics.

The policy of separating municipal from other elections has many adherents. This plan promises good results within a limited scope, provided it can be given a fair trial, but its success depends upon its general approval by active party men, and there seems to be little likelihood that their approval can be secured unless party men of the inactive class shall by activity obtain an influence at the anti-primary caucus that at the present time they are not possessed of.

Improvement in primary and electoral methods may better conditions, but it cannot reach the root of the evil.

The obvious remedy for so much of the evils of the time as are attributable to party disorganization consists of

retracing the steps that have deprived the majority of citizens of party initiative, and there is no serious obstacle to the adoption of this course, except the indifference or unwillingness of those most directly concerned, or their failure to see these opportunities. The existing distrust of political leaders extends to the system of politics that our national institutions and character have developed, and the very existence of political organizations, "machines," as they are called, seems to be an insuperable obstacle to active participation on the part of many citizens in party matters.

General protest is made against what is termed "fixing up a slate by the boss" before the primaries. Now the considerations that justify and, indeed, demand action by party managers to insure the presentation at primaries of candidates satisfactory to dominant active political forces are so obvious as not to deserve comment, were it not that

criticism of this action proceeds from those whose co-operation in party matters is desirable. It can hardly be claimed that the subject of presenting nominees should not be considered or provided for by any one, before the primaries take place. The initiative in this matter cannot rest with the whole body of electors, for this would result either in illy considered nominations or in a primary with its antecedent caucus before the final primary.

It may be that the practice abandoned in this country after the revolution, in use in England in the middle of the last century and now followed, if at all, among constitutional nations on the continent of Europe—the practice of permitting a few prominent party men to name candidates for office—would meet with the approval of some. But inasmuch as this function is not now performed by these prominent citizens, it would be necessary to delegate it to them in some way, or

at least pick out those whose initiative would be acceptable, before the scheme under consideration could get under way; and how can fitness to perform this important function be determined to the satisfaction of the masses. Moreover, if it be assumed that a number of prominent men can be clothed in some way with authority to present candidates for nomination; if it be assumed that this board has been duly constituted and that it is made up of the best and most patriotic members of the party concerned in community within which it is acting and that it can be depended upon to assume the duty of presenting nominees to the primary, it will be inconsistent with the theory of practice of popular sovereignty to surrender into its hand the exclusive power of presenting nominees; for this would mean an abolition of the primary itself. The right of others to propose nominations satisfactory to themselves would necessarily be reserved,

and if the nominating board should present at the primaries in any locality a ticket representing the highest political sagacity and public virtue it is almost certain that this ticket would meet defeat at the hands of candidates representing the average policy and purposes of the enrolled voters at the primary.

The plan is too fanciful to be further considered. No such board exists, and no one can be deprived of the right to present candidates for consideration at the primaries; least of all can those be excluded who enjoy the confidence of the majority of active partisans concerned in each case. Indeed, the trust reposed in the organization by those whom its leaders represent imposes on them a duty to anticipate as far as possible the wishes of their supporters with reference to the selection of candidates; and if, in any case, this duty should be unfaithfully performed, the confidence of the active primary elec-

tors would be transferred to others. If it should not be performed by existing organizations at all, the effect would not be to eliminate the machine from party politics, but to clear the way for ambitious men to erect another machine in the place of that surrendering its most important function; to erect a machine less likely to faithfully represent the public will than one which had derived its power from political success in antecedent party life.

There is no conceivable means, short of the overthrow of popular sovereignty, to destroy a power in political organizations that is solely derived from the support of a preponderance of active political forces in the locality concerned; and even if this means could be found, it would be foolish to destroy a power that may work for good, because it may also work for evil.

The only effective check upon improper use of the power in question lies in the conscientious discharge by

all citizens of their duties as partisan politicians. It is not accidental that a political machine exists in more or less perfect development in every local governmental unit in this country, nor is this to be accounted for as the result of the encroachment of selfish political schemers. The presentation to primaries of candidates for office by those upon whom party action has imposed responsibility for party management is a logical development of democratic principles inherent in popular sovereignty. By this practice alone can continuous adoption of party policies, approved by the majority, be secured.

Conscientious discharge of duty in party politics involves, at the threshold, a choice between organization and opposition. The aim of party activity being to obtain direct influence in shaping party policy, it is obviously advisable to co-operate with the organization unless good cause appear to the contrary. Whether such cause

exists will, in each case, depend upon the facts of that case.

The duties that, from the nature of the case, fall to private citizens in a republic may be summarized as follows: To see to it that proper candidates are nominated at the primaries; to take part in primary campaigns and vote at primaries; to participate in campaigns for the election of proper nominees by meeting with other electors in the public assemblages protected by the constitution, and by subscribing funds for necessary campaign purposes; and, finally, to vote conscientiously at elections. In other words, it falls to the people of a republic to choose their public servants, and to do this they must participate in every step of the process of choosing them.

The effect of failure to participate in the activities preceding the primaries has already been considered. Failure to vote at the primaries is so plainly

a neglect of public duty that it needs no comment.

Failure to take part in the campaign, by public or private advocacy of what each citizen deems advisable, deprives the people as a whole of a chance to judge public questions from all points of view, and when nearly all citizens except those who have private aims to subserve withdraw from the active exercise of this political function, the duty of conducting campaigns devolves upon professional politicians who, by reason of such withdrawal and of the criticism, just and unjust, accompanying it, stand discredited before the people and disqualified to perform this duty effectively.

Failure to subscribe necessary campaign funds forces politicians to resort to interests that need protection, or desire special privileges, in order to obtain these funds, and creates a reciprocal obligation on the part of those receiving funds from these sources, that

grows stronger each time the operation is repeated.

Failure to vote conscientiously on Election Day need not be considered.

Whoever refuses or neglects to perform any of these functions ceases, *pro tanto*, to take part in governing.

There is, at this time no divergence of opinion about the legitimate object of government. Its aim is to secure the greatest good for the greatest number. There can be no good government unless it be a government for the people. The establishment of a republic is an avowal on the part of its founders that the way to get a government for the people is to see that the people do the governing themselves. Government by the people, however, cannot be secured by constitution or by law. Whether there shall be, in any time or place, such a government depends on whether the people there and then are, as a whole, willing to take the trouble to partic-

ipate in the essential governmental functions assigned to them. In no true sense can there be a government by the people while the majority of law abiding citizens who desire government to be conducted solely in the general interest withdraw from the performance of essential political duties.

The government that results from such a withdrawal—as illustrated by the political condition of the country before described—is a government by the rest of the people. Those who do not participate in it are subject to those who conduct it and must have recourse to persuasion, threats or purchase, in order to secure for themselves anything that they may desire, in addition to that which may be voluntarily conceded to them.

The evils that result from such a government, is that it will be conducted so much in the interest of such of the people as take part in it, as to work injury to those who do not take part in

it, and to secure the highest attainable advantage to none of the people.

The remedy for these evils does not lie solely or mainly in criticism by good men or by bad men, of the acts of other men; or in any expedients that, while leaving the power to govern in the hands of a few, seeks to coerce those vested with power into making a proper use of it. It lies mainly in the performance, by those who desire to better civic conditions, of their plain duty as citizens; to the end that government by the people and for the people, may be established, or restored, and maintained.

III

METHODS

THE methods to be adopted by those who are politically inactive, in order to effectively resume the performance of their duties as citizens, must be determined as to details by local conditions; but a general line of policy results from a consideration of the purpose of such resumption.

This purpose is not to secure the nomination of candidates who belong to the business class, or the professional class, or any special class, or who represent any special interests. It is not to deprive bad men of all political power or to invest good men with the exclusive exercise of such power; to substitute an aristocracy for a democracy. The purpose under considera-

tion is to reinvest those who have neglected their political duty with power to directly influence nominations, so that better men may be nominated for office in all parties, and that those who obtain office may be more independent of harmful influences and may be relied upon to promote the general welfare.

To accomplish this aim, the make up and methods of the average organization which has been described will generally serve as a model. Leadership is necessary in each locality, for without it there will never come a time when the individuals there composing the dormant element in any party will awake all at once and become active. Whoever shall undertake the work will naturally call to his aid any of his neighbors who belong to his party whom he believes to be desirous of improved political conditions. These men will form a group whose aim will be to obtain influence among their fel-

low-citizens in the election district in which they reside.

Meetings may be held to attract attention and to awaken interest, but this is not essential, and may involve risk.

Effective work must be done by reaching electors individually in their homes or places of business or elsewhere. Through this work practical politicians obtain their influence, and it can be performed by a comparatively small number of workers in each district. After forming a working group in one election district, public spirited men may be induced, in other districts, to form similar groups, until the city is covered.

Possibly a city group or committee may come into use before the work has proceeded very far. If a working body shall be formed, no member of the party can properly be excluded; but responsible places will be filled exclusively by those who have good

government at heart, and it will greatly facilitate the work if, when possible, the local party leader is made to understand that the object of the movement is not to drive any party men out of the party or to put a new set of men in office or to set up a new organization, but to support the existing organization in what is right and to oppose it at the primaries only and always in case it (after conference) refuses to support fit men for nominees.

It has been said that the method of practical politicians would serve as a model. Perhaps it would be more illuminating to suggest that the subject should have applied to it the same consideration and practical good sense and good temper that must be applied to any business project in order to succeed in it.

[THE END]

2/ 115

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

**This book is under no circumstances to be
taken from the Building**

[illegible]

